



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/314,052	05/18/1999	DOUGLAS E. OTT	15006.0009	4618

7590

04/20/2004

D. EDWARD DOLGORUKOV  
MARSHALL AND MELHORN, LLC  
FOUR SEAGATE- 8TH FLOOR  
TOLEDO, OH 43604

EXAMINER
----------

THOMPSON, MICHAEL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

33

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/314,052

Applicant(s)

OTT ET AL.

Examiner

Michael M. Thompson

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 39-54 and 72-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 72-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>32</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 3763

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. This application contains claims 39-54 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 6. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-5 and 72-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartels et al. (4,621,632) in view of Daniell et al. (6,050,260). Bartels et al teaches all of the limitations of the claims except for explicitly reciting a humidity sensing means and a monitoring means connected to the humidity sensing means for monitoring the humidity of the gas and

Art Unit: 3763

keeping it within a determined threshold. Daniell et al. teaches a humidity sensing means and a monitoring means for monitoring the humidity of the gas and keeping it within a determined threshold. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to have modified the humidity device of Bartels et al. to monitor humidity by a humidity sensing means while keeping the humidity within a determined range or threshold for the well known purpose of preventing a cavity that is normally moist from drying out thereby causing inflammation causing discomfort.

### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments filed 01-02-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For purposes of clarity the rejection of record is an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. It is the Examiner's position that Applicant's intended use of the apparatus as claimed is not germane to the prior art rejection at hand. A recitation with respect to the manner in which an apparatus is intended to be employed does not impose any structural limitation upon the claimed apparatus which differentiates it from the prior art reference disclosing the structural limitations of the claim. In re Pearson, 494 F.2d 958, 177USPQ 7005 (CCPA 1973); In re Finsterwalder, 436 F.2d 1028, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971); In re Casey, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1963); Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (BdPatApp & Inter 1987). Furthermore, Danielle is not recited in the combination to "achieve the purpose of Applicant." The fact that Bartels in combination with Danielle teach a different strategy for humidification is irrelevant. The only relevance is whether the combination teaches the limitations Applicant's broadly claimed apparatus. The Examiner

• Art Unit: 3763

asserts that the claim limitations have been met wherein Bartels teaches a device for humidification and Danielle teaches a similar interest in increasing the humidity to maximum by alternatively using a humidity sensor. It should be noted that the reasons for utilizing humidified air of the lung cavity is similar to the reasons for using humidified air for the body cavities by maintaining humidity thereby providing moisture of the cavity. As the combination is recited Bartels may suffer from the deficiencies of knowing what the humidity is in the system and Danielle remedies the supposed deficiencies by indicating the use of a humidity sensor. It is obviously the intent of Danielle to provide and maintain a base level of humidity.

### *Conclusion*

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

- Art Unit: 3763


### Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Michael Thompson whose telephone number is (703) 305-1619. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 am to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Primary, Brian Casler, can be reached on (703) 308-3552. The official fax phone number for all submissions to the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Michael M. Thompson

Patent Examiner

  
**BRIAN L. CASLER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**

MT 

April 16, 2004